REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on July 1, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1, 3 and 5-7, amended claims 2 and 4, and added claims 8-15. Claims 2 and 4 are the independent claims. Claims 2, 4 and 8-15 are now pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The drawings have been objected to for not being designated by a legend such as –Prior Art— because only that which is old is illustrated. In response thereto, amended replacement Figures 1 and 2 marked with the legend "Prior Art" are submitted herein. Thus, the objection should be withdrawn.

The specification has been objected to because of an alleged informality. In particular, the Examiner points out that page 8, line 8 of the written description refers to reference numeral 202 of Fig. 7; however, reference numeral 202 is not shown in Fig. 7. In response, the specification has been editorially amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner, along with other informalities noted during review of the application. It is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 have been objected to because of alleged informalities. The Examiner indicates that claim 3 refers to fourth – sixth scales without mentioning first, second or third scales, and claim 4 refers to seventh and eighth without mentioning

first – sixth scales. Claim 3 has been cancelled, and claim 4 has been amended to correct the informality. The objection therefore no longer is applicable and accordingly should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Oku* (US Patent No. 6,151,104). Claims 1, 5 and 7 have been cancelled. The rejection therefore no longer is applicable and accordingly should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hasegawa* (US Patent No. 5,515,138). Claims 1, 6 and 7 have been cancelled. The rejection therefore no longer is applicable and accordingly should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sakamoto et al.* (*Sakamoto*) (US Patent No. 4,786,944). Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 have been canceled. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to be in independent form and to include further limitations. It is submitted that amended claims 2 and 4 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

It is well settled that a reference may anticipate a claim within the purview of 35 USC §102 only if all the features and all the relationships recited in the claim are taught by the reference either by clear disclosure or under the principle of inherency. However, the cited reference does not disclose various features recited in independent claims 2 and 4.

First, Applicant's amended independent claim 2 recites a film fixing instrument capable for fixing films with different scales. The film fixing instrument includes a loader for loading the film and a **removable and reversible** adjuster for adjusting the window. The loader has a loader window for light transmitting and a plurality of couplers on sides of the window. The adjuster has a plurality of fixers coupled with the plurality of couplers. **The adjuster is selectively installed on or removed from the loader to adjust the window**. The adjuster has **a square shape** and has an upper edge, a lower edge, a first side edge and a second side edge. The upper edge is opposite to the lower edge, the first side edge is opposite to the second side edge, **the plurality of fixers are on the upper edge and the lower edge**, and the distance of the first side edge to the plurality of fixers is larger than that of the second side edge to the plurality of fixers. When the adjuster is coupled with the loader by arranging the first side edge on one side of the window, film of a first scale is adjacent to the second side edge and fixed on the film fixing instrument. When the reversed adjuster is coupled with the loader by arranging the second side edge on one side of the window, film of a second scale is adjacent to the first side edge and fixed on the film fixing instrument. When the adjuster is removed and not coupled with the loader, film of a third scale is fixed on the film fixing instrument.

In contrast, *Sakamoto* discloses a negative carrier 12, which comprises a movable base plate 65 and a negative film holding plate 66 movable mounted on the base plate 65. These plates 65 and 66 are interconnected to provide two-dimensional

movements of the color negative film 13 (Col. 7, lines 43-48). The plate 66 of the negative carrier 12 includes a masking device 18 having four opaque plates 77 to 80 adapted to move independently in a rectilinear manner, thereby to define and change an opening enclosed within the inside edges of the four opaque plates 77 to 80 as to its size and location. The rectilinear movement of each opaque plate 77 to 80 is guided by a combination of slots 75 and pins 76. It should be noted in this example that the pins 76 are fixedly mounted on the negative film holding plate 66 of the negative carrier 12 (Col. 7, line 63 – Col. 8, line 4). *Sakamoto* fails to disclose (or even to suggest) a **removable and reversible** adjuster for adjusting the window either by selectively **installing the adjuster on or removing it from the loader or by reversing the adjuster on the loader**. Instead, *Sakamoto* discloses to define and change an opening by the rectilinear movement of each opaque plate. Besides, there is no disclosure (or even a suggestion) from *Sakamoto* that when the reversed adjuster is coupled with the loader by arranging the second side edge on one side of the window, the film of a second scale is adjacent to the first side edge and fixed on the film fixing instrument. Further, *Sakamoto* fails to disclose (or suggest) that as the adjuster is removed and not coupled with the loader, the film of a third scale is fixed on the film fixing instrument. Moreover, *Sakamoto* fails to disclose (or suggest) that the adjuster has a square shape and has **plurality of fixers which are on both the upper edge and the lower edge**, as recited in claim 2. As such, it is submitted that Applicant's independent claim 2, as well as the claims 8-11 dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by (or rendered obvious by) the cited reference.

Second, Applicant's amended independent claim 4 recites a film fixing instrument capable for fixing films with different scales. The film fixing instrument includes a loader for loading the film and a **removable** adjuster for adjusting the window. The loader has a window for light transmitting and a plurality of couplers on sides of the window. The adjuster has a plurality of fixers coupled with the plurality of couplers. **The adjuster is selectively installed on or removed from the loader to adjust the window**. The adjuster has an L shape and has a first outer edge, a second outer edge, a first inner edge and a second inner edge. **Both the first outer edge and the second outer edge are on the sides of the window, and both the first inner edge and the second inner edge are within said sides of the window.** Therefore, **when** the adjuster is coupled with the loader, the film of a first scale is **adjacent to the first inner edge and the second inner edge** and fixed on the film fixing instrument. **When** the adjuster is removed and not coupled with the loader, the film of a second scale is adjacent to sides of the window and fixed on the film fixing instrument.

In contrast, *Sakamoto* fails to disclose (or suggest) a **removable** adjuster for adjusting the window either by **selectively installing the adjuster on, or removing it from the loader**, as recited in claim 4. Rather *Sakamoto* discloses to define and change an opening is by rectilinear movement of each opaque plate. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion from *Sakamoto that* the adjuster has an L shape, wherein **both the first outer edge and the second outer edge are on said sides of said window, and both of the first inner edg and the second inn r dge are within the**

sides of th window. As revealed and apparent from Fig 4 of the reference, only one outer edge of the plate 79/ 80, which the Examiner relied on for a teaching of an L-shaped adjuster, is located on the side of the opening 66a, and both inner edges of the plate 79/ 80 are not within the sides of the opening. Moreover, *Sakamoto* fails to disclose (or suggest) that **when** the adjuster is coupled with the loader, the film of a first scale is **adjacent to the first inner edge and the second inner edge** and fixed on the film fixing instrument. In addition, *Sakamoto* fails to disclose (or suggest) that **when** the adjuster is removed and not coupled with the loader, the film of a second scale is adjacent to sides of the window and fixed on the film fixing instrument, as recited in claim 4. As such, it is submitted that Applicant's independent claim 4, as well as the claims 12-15 dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by (or rendered obvious by) the cited reference. It is therefore submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Based on the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such a Notice, with allowed claims 2, 4 and 8-15 earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the

undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

October 29, 2003
Date

Steven M. Rabin.
Registration No. 29,102
RABIN & BERDO, PC
Customer No. 23995
(202) 371-8976 (Telephone)
(202) 408-0924 (Facsimile)

SMR:pjl